

ALLIANT 2 SMALL BUSINESS GWAC
Questions & Responses
Release #3

Thank you for your interest in Alliant 2 Small Business.

In addressing questions it is the Government's position that if the solicitation's position is self-evident, the response to a question may simply be that the solicitation already addresses the matter in the manner the Government intended for it to be addressed, or "The solicitation is clear".

While the Government may include one or more specific solicitation passages in a response to a question, interested parties are reminded that section L.3 of the solicitation states, "Offerors are instructed to read the entire solicitation document, including all attachments in Section J, prior to submitting questions and/or preparing an offer. Omission of any information from the proposal submission requirements may result in rejection of the offer."

Questions were not extensively edited for grammar, punctuation or spelling. Not every question is shown. Only those questions, or portions of questions, that were deemed frequently asked and/or those that were deemed to benefit the procurement process are shown.

Questions and responses are organized into topic areas shown below. Interested parties stand to benefit from reviewing all statements, questions, and responses.

- Generic Questions
- Volume 1 – General
- Volume 2 – Relevant Experience
- Volume 3 – Past Performance
- Volume 4 – Systems, Certifications, and Clearances
- Volume 5 – Organizational Risk Assessment
- Volume 6 – Cost-Price
- Volume 7 – Responsibility
- Post Award

Additional Question and Response Documents will be posted to FBO as appropriate. It is the responsibility of the offerors to periodically check the solicitation on FBO for more information.

As a reminder, Offerors shall address all questions via e-mail to the Alliant 2 Small Business GWAC PCO at A2SB@gsa.gov. All questions must be submitted in the format identified in L.3.5 of the solicitation.

Generic Questions

Generic Questions		
Q&R #	Question	Response
3-1	Please confirm the naming convention required for the SF30s. We assume it's ABC.VOL1.SF301, SF302, etc. but hadn't seen an updated "Proposal Format Table" in an Amendment and/or the question asked officially in one of the Q&A posts.	Each amendment clearly addresses whether or not acknowledgement is required.
3-2	Section L.2.2 states that the Government intends to award one GWAC master contract as a result of this solicitation. This contradicts the stated intent to award 80 contracts.	FAR 52.216-1 Type of Contract is simply indicating that a Governmentwide Acquisition Contract will be awarded. The RFP is clear concerning the number of awards that will be made.

Volume 1

Volume 1		
Q&R #	Question	Response
3-3	Carriers for hand delivered proposal require telephone number for package recipient. Please provide appropriate telephone number.	The telephone number to use for this purpose is 816-823-2067.
3-4	Section L.5.1.4 states that Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters can only be used for Prime Contractor's corporate structure. If an offeror wants to use a subcontractor experience example and the contract is to the parent company or an affiliate of the subcontractor, can this experience example be used? And if so, how is the relationship to be documented?	L.5.1.4 is clear that a meaningful relationship commitment letter shall only be used within the offering Prime Contractor's corporate structure.
3-5	In accordance with the instructions included in the Proposal Format Table, the Joint Venture Agreement must be in "font type and size (10 to 12) point Arial; Margins of 1 inch". If the offeror has an existing signed JV agreement that has been in place for several years, to include several signed amendments, and which does not match the aforementioned font type and size or margins, may the offeror submit such agreement in its existing format?	Yes. If the joint venture agreement exists then that document may be submitted as is.
3-6	As a Prime Contractor in a business arrangement we are using a subcontractor's past performance. Our subcontractor has a meaningful relationship via a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary. As a Prime Contractor, are we allowed to cite past performances from our subcontractors meaningful relationship?	L.5.1.4 is clear that a meaningful relationship commitment letter shall only be used within the offering Prime Contractor's corporate structure.

Volume 2

Volume 2		
Q&R #	Question	Response
3-7	If a company is submitting a single award BPA as one of its PSC references, should it include 1) the BPA SOW, 2) the SOWs for each of the task orders awarded thus far, or 3) both the BPA and task order SOWs?	When a collection of task orders under an indefinite delivery task order contract or BPA is used as a Relevant Experience Project, offerors should use business judgment to determine which information satisfies the RFP requirements.
3-8	In order to verify a PSC Relevant Experience Project, when the FPDS-NG is incomplete or inaccurate, the government is asking that a copy of the contract statement of work (SOW) be provided. Our original SOW did not contain integral IT work, which was added during the first modification. Will GSA accept the modification, and supporting detailed documentation in lieu of the original SOW? The details of the IT work, which alone accounts for more than a \$1M of the contract, will also be supported in the past performance questionnaire signed by the CO or COR.	A modification by its nature changes the SOW to incorporate the changes. Offerors should use their business judgment to determine what information satisfies the RFP requirements.
3-9	If the BPA was awarded under a PSC in scope, but the task orders under the BPA have a different PSC, can we use the BPA PSC to submit the project?	Offerors should use business judgment to determine what documentation verifies the RFP requirements.
3-10	Can task orders under a single IDIQ be submitted separately to address different Leading Edge Technologies? For example, if we have one IDIQ, can 30 total individual and unique task orders be submitted covering all technologies?	The RFP is clear on the topic of using a collection of task orders or using individual task orders to satisfy the RFP requirements.
3-11	If an Offeror has 4 distinct projects for PSC group one, with the same PSC Code – is this acceptable? For instance: All projects – although distinct - have the same PSC Code. Are we allowed to use ALL four projects in group one in light of the same PSC Code?	L.5.2.2 clearly addresses this matter.
3-12	A contract was originally awarded in August 2008 as "base + three option years." During the third option year, the client re-awarded the work for an additional "base + four option years" under a separate BPA (with different contract/task order numbers). Both SOWs (original contract and the continuation) are identical. There was no break in service between the original contract and the subsequent BPA task order. May we please count these contracts as a single "project" under the PSC and/or LET categories?	The definition of a Relevant Experience Project is clear in the solicitation. Clearly in this example both contracts stand on their own. They do not meet the standards of a "collection of task orders".

3-13	<p>Some agencies only issue prime contracts directly to a management contractor that is acting under a specific government contract in conjunction with the agency and all orders, which may be referred to as "subcontracts", are issued via the management contractor even though as a sub-contractor to the management company, you are still working directly with the agency. The Department of Energy's Laboratories, often utilize a management contractor that is a not-for-profit company that has been established for the sole purpose of managing and operating a specific laboratory for the U.S. Department of Energy. Would contracts issued by the management contractor, on behalf of an agency, be considered prime contracts for the purposes of this solicitation?</p>	<p>L.5 is clear that all projects and past performance submitted in response to this solicitation shall have been performed as a Prime Contractor.</p>
3-14	<p>"Many original contract award documents (SF 1449 etc.) include additional attached pages. These pages can include pricing data and other proprietary information." 1. Are these additional pages required? 2. If yes, please confirm that subcontractors may include these additional pages in their sealed response, with a redacted copy in the prime's offer package, to protect their proprietary data.</p>	<p>The RFP simply asks for the award form. Offerors should use their business judgment to determine what additional documents are needed to verify the claimed points.</p>
3-15	<p>Subcontractors have proprietary and sensitive financial data embedded in their awarded contracts. This is information that is usually not shared with other vendors. Please confirm that a subcontractor's relevant experience project package be contained on a disk in a sealed envelope, and the prime's disk have a redacted representation of that subcontractor's project for purposes of presenting it on the scorecard and for evaluation.</p>	<p>It is clear in the solicitation that the only sealed envelopes allowed from CTA members is for the GSA Form 527.</p>

3-16	<p>Reference the following statement - "If a collection of task orders are used as a single project under an Indefinite Delivery task order contract or a BPA, the collection must be all of the task orders awarded under that contract or BPA. The project cannot be unbundled and individual task orders used to satisfy other Relevant Experience Projects (PSC or LET)." This statement prevents IDIQ contract holders who have performed hundreds of TOs/projects over the past five (5) years from combining like / distinct TOs / projects together to meet dollar value requirements while still allowing the use of a larger TO for another PSC Code or LET Project.</p> <p>Will the Government consider providing more specific language as to when TOs/projects can be combined without impacting the use of other TOs / projects under the same IDIQ.</p>	<p>The solicitation is clear that from an Indefinite Delivery Task Order Contract or a BPA the offeror can use 1) a collection of task orders OR 2) separate individual task orders, but NOT both 1) a collection of orders AND 2) separate task orders. In order to use a collection of task orders under an Indefinite Delivery Task Order Contract or BPA, the Indefinite Delivery Task Order Contract must be well defined for a specific purpose.</p>
3-17	<p>For some contracts, especially in DoD, it is very difficult to identify the actual Contracting Officer, let alone acquire a signature. If we provide the Contract Specialist having cognizant authority over the contract, will this suffice in the Contracting Officer section and associated signatures for J-P-2 and J-P.3?</p>	<p>The solicitation clearly states the verification requirements for Relevant Experience Projects.</p>
3-18	<p>In PSC Group Relevant Experience - Fair Opportunity Task Order, does the statement "Full and Open competition after exclusion of sources" in the "Extent Competed" field in FPDS provide the required validation?</p>	<p>No. The field "Fair Opportunity/Limited Sources:" is the correct field to verify fair opportunity against an MA/IDIQ contract.</p>
3-19	<p>Will it be possible to substitute a CPARS for the signed J.P-2 and J.P-3?</p>	<p>No. The RFP clearly requires the submission of J.P-2 and J.P-3.</p>
3-20	<p>the Offeror is not limited to citing their PSC Project to that PSC coded as D399 under the condition it meets another PSC definition. If the scope of work and deliverables of the proposed PSC relevant experience Project meets a differently coded PSC, follow the submission requirements of this solicitation to support your determination. Question - For D399 coded projects, if we align to another PSC code, are we to highlight relevant scope and deliverables in the PWS (treat as FPDS is accurate), or treat it as "FPDS-NG UNAVAILABLE, INCOMPLETE OR INACCURATE"?</p>	<p>The solicitation clearly provides the procedures for PSC Relevant Experience validation. Clearly in this example FPDS is Unavailable, Incomplete, or Inaccurate.</p>

3-21	The RFP states that If a collection of task orders are used as a single project under a BPA that the collection must be all of the task orders awarded under that contract or BPA. Would the Government clarify the documentation required to support such a collection of task orders? For example, is a J.P-2 and FPDS report required for each task order in the collection (this may result in a single reference that is well over 100 pages with supporting documentation)? Or, is it the Government's intention that the collection of task orders be represented by one J.P-2 and FPDS reports provided in a quantity sufficient to meet the RFP requirements (e.g., totaling \$1 million)?	When a collection of task orders under an indefinite delivery task order contract or BPA is used as a Relevant Experience Project, offerors should use business judgment to determine which information satisfies the RFP requirements.
3-22	Will the government please confirm that if the offeror performed a project under a joint venture (performance is split between both entities of the joint venture) that has a separate duns number than the one assigned to the offeror and the offeror is the managing member of the this joint venture, the offeror can use this project performed under the joint venture as a relevant experience (section L.5.2.2) & Lead Edge Technology Relevant Experience (L.5.2.3) ?	L.5.1.5.3 clearly stipulates the parameters for claiming prime contractor relevant experience from an existing or previous joint venture or partnership.
3-23	The Government defined a Relevant Experience "project" is defined as (1) a single contract. Does a single-award IDIQ contract meet the definition of a single contract?	It is clear in the solicitation that an indefinite delivery task order contract can be used as a project if a collection of task orders under that contract is used as a single project.
3-24	If a collection of task orders are used as a single project under an Indefinite Delivery task order contract and if the collection must be of all the task orders awarded under that contract, may we submit the contract Statement of Work or must we submit all Task Order Statements of Work?	When a collection of task orders under an indefinite delivery task order contract or BPA is used as a Relevant Experience Project, offerors should use business judgment to determine which information satisfies the RFP requirements.
3-25	The RFP states that "the offeror must also identify and call attention to the specific section or sections of the SOW that support the claim of having performed the PSC and any other claimed scoring elements." Does the Government expect references to the scoring elements of L.5.2.2.2 - L.5.2.2.6 within the provided SOW?	It is clear in the solicitation that L.5.2.2.3, L.5.2.2.4, and L.5.2.2.5 can only be verified by FPDS-NG. The RFP is clear concerning the validation of L.5.2.2.3 and L.5.2.2.6.
3-26	Due to the updated J.P-2 and J.P-3 Templates in Amendment 3, will the Government extend the due date at least another week so we may send updated templates to our customers and receive them in time for submission?	It is clear from Amendment 3 that any version of J.P-2 and J.P-3 is acceptable.

3-27	When bundling TOs to be used as a single PSC or LET reference, is it necessary to complete a J.P-2/J.P-3 form for each TO in the bundle, or is one J.P-2/J.P-3 under the BPA contract number with supporting FPDS reports for each TO sufficient?	The RFP is clear that only one J.P-2/J.P-3 document is required for each Relevant Experience Project.
3-28	When bundling TOs to be used as a single PSC or LET reference, is it acceptable to include TOs in the bundle that are less than 1 year old provided the BPA itself is greater than 1 year old?	It is clear that If a collection of task orders under an indefinite delivery task order contract is used for a Relevant Experience Project, all task orders are included.
3-29	For CLASSIFIED Federal Government contracts that have an Award Document and/or SOW that are CLASSIFIED and not releasable and cannot have an FPDS record, please confirm that the GSA will accept the customer's (CO or COR's with email to CO) signature on the JP2 and/or JP3 as verification for the required information to receive the PSC and/or LET points.	The RFP is clear as to what documentation is required for Relevant Experience Project validation.
3-30	In response 1.36 of Question & Responses #1, GSA acknowledged that an offeror could use legacy PSC codes R414 and R421 for the PSC Group II that were merged into PSC code R425. If an offeror submits two different projects registered under FPDS-NG (one with code R421 and one with code R425), could these projects be consider two different PSC citations to comply with item 3 of L.5.2.2 PSC Group Relevant Experience in section L?	No. In the example only PSC code R425 can be used, and only once.

Volume 3

Volume 3		
Q&R #	Question	Response
3-31	Consistent with RFP Section L.5.2.2, please confirm that the Government will accept a signed award fee evaluation document as proof of positive past performance in a case of where it has not been included in CPARS	The response to this question is clearly addressed by the solicitation.
3-32	Since contractors are reliant on the government to schedule reviews of their purchasing system and have not control or when an audit or review is scheduled will the government consider removing the last sentence of the statement "The CPSR should be no older than 5 years. If the CPSR is older than five years, the Offeror will not earn points in this scoring element."	An upcoming amendment will remove the requirement that the Contractor Purchasing System Review (CPSR) be no older than five years.

3-33	Given the limited bandwidth of CO's and COR's at this time of the year and the volume of contracting activities late in the fourth quarter each fiscal year, would the government consider accepting a J.P-5 in lieu of an interim CPARS for a contract with <1yr performance to qualify as a relevant experience project under L.5.2.1 Relevant Experience Projects.	No. The solicitation clearly does not support that.
3-34	Would the Government consider allowing "no comments" in the sections on the J.P-5 forms where the CO/COR has provided an N/A response? If comments are required for each N/A response, we will have to ask our COs/CORs to re-accomplish the J.P-5s for most of our projects. Also, some contracting officers have suggested that they will simply type in "not applicable" in the comments section for any N/A responses.	Please refer to CPARS guidance to ascertain if comments/narrative is required to support a CPARS rating.
3-35	If a contract has ended and the agency only completed an interim past performance rating in PPIRS, will this meet the requirement that "Past Performance (PPIRS) information exists"? [the client has retired]	L.5.3.1 clearly answers this question.
3-36	If we are unable to access a CPARS due to it being 4 years old and archived, can the government still access it during the proposal evaluation or MUST we ask for a COR signature?	The RFP is clear that either the PPIRS/CPARS report or J.P-5 is submitted by the Offeror and contained in its offer.

Volume 4

Volume 4		
Q&R #	Question	Response
3-37	Is a letter from DCAA with the results of their annual review/audit acceptable documentation? Our initial audit was performed in 2002. DCAA has conducted audits and/or reviews for every year up to 2013.	Clearly yes, if the letter satisfies the solicitation standards in L.5.4.1
3-38	At one customer, we have approved CPFF billing rates. These have been audited and determined acceptable. However the customer does not perform annual audits on top of DCAA audits. Is documentation on these approved billing rates acceptable? We submit Forward Pricing Rate Proposals every year. DCMA never responds. Does the proposal submission constitute acceptable documentation?	The offeror should read the solicitation standards in L.5.4.3 and respond accordingly.

3-39	In the case of a SBA approved 8(a) Mentor Protégé JVs, where the SBA permits the JV to assume the mentor's certifications and systems for competitive purposes, would the government consider acceptable to use the Industry Certification (L.5.4.6-L.5.4.9) of the Mentor to obtain these points for Alliant 2 SB?	The standards for L.5.4 and a joint venture CTA are clear in the RFP.
3-40	Amendment 2 removed the following statement from the RFP without corresponding explanation in Q&A: "For audit verification documents older than five years, offerors must supplement their submission with self-evaluations of their accounting systems and include an audit by an independent certified public accountant (CPA) of their choosing indicating that there have not been material changes to the offeror's accounting system (as defined in FAR 16.301-3(a)(3)) since the time of the DCAA/DCMA/CFA audit. Without these verification documents, the Offeror will not earn points in this scoring element." Please confirm that per this revision, offerors with CAS verification greater than 5 years need only provide a self-certification that no material changes have been made since the last audit.	The amended L.5.4.1 is clear what is required for verification.
3-41	Our company does not have approved Forward Pricing Rates. We do have approved Provisional Billing Rates and can provide a redacted letter from DCAA. Will this meet the requirement of approved Forward Pricing Rates and allow companies to score accordingly using Provisional Billing Rates the same as if we had Forward Pricing Rates?	L.5.4.3 is clear on this matter.

Volume 5

Volume 5		
Q&R #	Question	Response
3-42	In the case of a SBA approved 8(a) Mentor Protégé JVs, which requires extensive vetting from the SBA in areas such performance risk, would the government modify the requirements so that this type of JV can take advantage of the 7500 points without having performed in the past?	The standards for L.5.5 and a joint venture CTA are clear in the RFP.

3-43	We currently have a Joint Venture where the Federal Government awarded a contract to two members of the joint venture. There is no prime/sub relationship for this contract because this contract was awarded to the two members of the joint venture. For the ongoing work under this contract, we are assuming this arrangement qualifies Dynanet to use the relevant experience of our JV Partner and claim that the requirements of L.5.5 Organizational Risk Assessment have been met. Please confirm.	L.5.5 clearly defines "previously performed" for a joint venture.
3-44	With regard to L.5.5.1 – Previously Performed, as evidence, the government is requesting a copy of the subcontract, which alone may not substantiate that the subcontractor actually previously performed work and billed hours to the offerors prime contract. Will the Government consider requiring proof of “previously performed” subcontractor performance?	The RFP is clear concerning "previously performed" as it relates to a subcontractor in a CTA. If the subcontract does not provide, unequivocally, evidence of previous performance the offeror should use its business judgment to validate this requirement by other means.
3-45	Regarding the Government's response to General Q&A #2-7, evaluation of existing SBA-approved 8(a) Mentor Protégé agreements and SBA approved JV agreements does not validate the definition of “Previously Performed” under the solicitation. Will the Government please confirm that to qualify for the 7500 risk points the SBA 8(A) Mentor Protégé JV will have to validate “previous performance” exists using FPDS to show actual contract(s) issued and executed to the 8(a) Mentor Protégé JV as proof, as well as SBA's Official Approval for the contract, as required under the regulations to ensure no affiliation exists for meeting size standard requirements?	The RFP is clear concerning "previously performed" as it relates to joint venture CTAs.

Volume 6

Volume 6		
Q&R #	Question	Response
3-46	The J.P-8 template has a format error in column C- Direct Labor Rates, the where the cells are not formatted to indicate it is a \$. The error affects the 4th row under each labor group, starting at Labor ID #124. This error is present in both the Government Site and Contractor Site. Does the government want us to correct the formatting or leave as it is?	The government is aware of this. It has no bearing on the calculations other than missing a \$ sign in these cells under direct labor. It does not require reformatting and may be left as is.

3-47	For offerors proposing as an unpopulated Joint Venture, who therefore do not have Fringe, Overhead, and G&A (Columns D-F in Attachment J.P-8 Cost-Price Template) can we simply provide our max DL rate in Column C and then insert a column for our fully burdened JV rate for that category that then gets escalation auto-calculated on it for the rest of the spreadsheet? To back up our fully loaded JV rate for each labor category can each member of the JV then submit their own separate sealed packages showing how indirects are derived and include those sealed packages within the proposal submission just as the GSA form 527s are submitted (separately prepared and sealed by each JV member but included in the one solicitation package delivery to the government)?	L.5.1.5.1 is clear concerning Volume 6 and joint ventures.
------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

Volume 7

Volume 7		
Q&R #	Question	Response
	No Questions or Responses in this Volume.	

Post Award		
Q&R #	Question	Response
3-48	In the proposal there is reference to maximum rates and, in an answer to a previous question, allowances are made to upwardly adjust rates if additional skill set requirements such as TS/SCI are levied for a position. May the same be said such that we have the flexibility to lower rates on positions if the requirements of the task merit such reduction?	The labor rates in the resulting contracts are ceiling rates for time and materials and labor hour type task orders. You can clearly submit lower pricing on task orders.